# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE, NASHVILLE DIVISION

NICHOLAS ENNIS, FIREARMS POLICY COALITION, INC., : and FIREARMS POLICY FOUNDATION .:

**Plaintiffs** 

Civil Action No. – v. 3:20-cv-00805

Mag. Judge Holmes

Chief Judge Crenshaw

COUNTY OF SUMNER, TENNESSEE; ANTHONY HOLT in his official capacity: as County Executive and County Mayor: of Sumner County, TN; ROY "SONNY" WEATHERFORD in his official capacity: as Sumner County Sheriff; CHRIS SANFORD in his individual and official: capacities; KYLE MAHANEY in his individual and official capacities: JUSTIN DOWNS in his individual and official capacities; and CARL EDISON

**Defendants** 

in his individual and official capacities,:

# Supplemental Joint Case Resolution Status Report

Counsel for the parties filed a First Joint Status Report on February 24, 2021, explaining they had engaged in settlement discussions and exchanged settlement proposals, in that Plaintiffs had made a settlement proposal which Defendants rejected and Defendants had submitted a counter-proposal which remained pending. The report also stated that the parties were in the process of exchanging an initial round of written discovery requests and would continue working through that process in gathering additional facts as they may pertain to further settlement discussions.

This Court issued an order on March 1, 2021, noting the case resolution plan requires the parties to have "conducted enough discovery or otherwise exchanged enough information ... to substantively evaluate and discuss settlement." Dkt. No. 27. The Court directed the parties to file this supplemental joint case resolution report by March 22, 2021, confirming that "(i) Plaintiff responded to Defendants' February 19 counter-offer and (ii) counsel for the parties thereafter discussed specific settlement terms in an attempt at resolution of this case," and "stat[ing] whether the parties reached a settlement and, if not, what specific steps they intend to take to facilitate the likelihood of successful settlement efforts in the future." *Id*.

In response to the Court's direction, counsel for all parties initially state that they believe they have "conducted enough discovery or otherwise exchanged enough information ... to substantively evaluate and discuss settlement," because they have had several substantive discussions to date about the parties' respective positions regarding the major facts, claims, and defenses involved in the case. This communication includes multiple substantive discussions well before the First Joint Status Report was filed, such that all counsel and all parties have been fully informed of and able to thoughtfully discuss all the major issues in dispute even before the parties commenced their initial exchange of written discovery requests. Since then, substantial additional information has been developed and is continuing to be

developed in that discovery process, such that the parties are even better equipped to evaluate and discuss the case for all purposes, including any possible settlement.

In response to the Court's specific inquiries, the parties confirm that Plaintiffs have responded to Defendants' counter-proposal for settlement on March 10, 2021, at which time Plaintiffs rejected that proposal. The parties also confirm that, at the same time, counsel for the parties engaged in another lengthy discussion about all the major legal and factual issues in dispute, their respective positions regarding each issue, and the possibility of reaching settlement under various alternative terms. The parties did not reach a resolution during this discussion. Regarding "what specific steps they intend to take to facilitate the likelihood of successful settlement efforts in the future," counsel for all parties have agreed to continue discussing with their respective clients the major issues in dispute, to keep an open line of communication about all such matters as the case moves forward, and to endeavor to resolve any disputes that can be resolved for purposes of facilitating a full or partial settlement based on further discussions with their respective clients and further analysis of the major issues in dispute. To this end, counsel for the parties intend to conduct another conference regarding the settlement prospects on or before April 30, 2021.

Counsel for the parties will keep the Court apprised of any developments in their discussions that may lead to a settlement on any of the claims involved.

Dated this 19th day of March, 2021

Respectfully Submitted,

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

### /s/ Raymond M. DiGuiseppe

Raymond M. DiGuiseppe

The DiGuiseppe Law Firm, P.C.

4320 Southport-Supply Road, Suite 300

Southport, NC 28461 Tel.: 910-713-8804

Email: <u>law.rmd@gmail.com</u>
Pro Hac Vice admission

### /s/ Eugene Volokh (with permission)

Eugene Volokh

385 Charles E. Young Dr. E.

Los Angeles, CA 90095

Tel.: 310-206-3926

Email: volokh@law.ucla.edu

Pro Hac Vice admission

#### /s/Michael P. Sousa (with permission)

Michael P. Sousa

Law Offices of Michael P. Sousa, APC

3232 Governor Dr., Suite A

San Diego, CA 92122 Tel.: 858-453-6122

Email: msousa@msousalaw.com

Pro Hac Vice admission

## /s/ Lloyd R. Tatum (with permission)

Lloyd R. Tatum BPR # 011326 Tatum & Tatum Tatum Building 124 E. Main Street

P.O. Box 293

Henderson, TN 38340 Tel.: 731-989-3493

Email: Lloydtatum1@yahoo.com

Local Co-Counsel

## Attorneys for Defendants

### /s/Leah May Dennen (with permission)

Leah May Dennen, #12711 Sumner County Law Director Benjamin C. Allen, #35923 355 North Belvedere Drive, Room 303

Gallatin, TN 37066 Tel.: 615-451-6060

<u>LeahMay@sumnercountytn.gov</u>

Ben@sumnercountytn.gov

## /s/Thomas B. Russell (with permission)

Thomas B. Russell, #26011 Sarah L. Locker, #31994

GULLETT SANFORD ROBINSON

& MARTIN PLLC

150 Third Avenue South, Suite 1700

Nashville, TN 37201 Tel.: 615-244-4994

trussell@gsrm.com; slocker@gsrm.com

#### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 19th day of March, 2021, a copy of the foregoing was filed electronically. Notice of this filing will be sent by operation of the Court's electronic filing system to all parties indicated on the electronic filing receipt. Any other parties not included among those subscribed to the electronic filing system will be served by regular mail. Parties may access this filing through the electronic filing system.

/s/ Raymond M. DiGuiseppe